

REMARKS


In the Office Action, claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Specifically, the claims are rejected because the phrase “the ordered pair” in claim 15 lacks a proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claim 15 to depend from claim 14. As noted in the Office Action, claim 14 includes a first recitation of an ordered pair. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the amendment of claim 15 renders the rejections of claim 15 and 16 moot and Applicant requests withdrawal of these rejections.

The Office Action objects to the form of claim 21 and suggests a number of options for correcting the language of the claim. Applicant has amended the claim in accordance with one suggestion (option I(d) in the Office Action) such that the amended claim now commences with: “A computer readable medium encoded with computer executable instructions for performing a method of...” Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, and in view of the foregoing, the claims are believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, he or she is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP



ANTHONY G. SMYTH, Reg. No. 55,636
Tel. No. 650.233.4802

Date: November 14, 2007
Reply to Customer No. 27,498